DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 723 TM 800 218

AUTHOR Rice, William K., Jr.; And Others
TITLE The Functional Language Assessment: A Short Test of English Proficiency.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (64th, Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Students; Cutting Scores; Elementary Education; *English (Second Language); Language Fluency; Language Proficiency; *Language Tests; *Speech Tests; Test Norms; Test Reliability; Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS Functional Language Assessment

ABSTRACT

The Functional Language Assessment (FLA) is a screening test which, when used in combination with teacher ratings and English achievement test scores, helps identify students, aged 5 through 13 from non-English speaking backgrounds, in need of bilingual programs. The language proficiency test can be administered by school staff who do not speak the student's home language. Three reliability studies indicate that the same observed student behavior will receive similar ratings from testers and that students will perform similarly on a test-retest. Factor analysis indicates two factors which remain stable across different populations: the ability to produce oral English and the ability to understand oral English. The test is inexpensive, needs no special equipment or specialized personnel, and can be administered to any child regardless of home background or age. (Author/CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187723

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Functional Language Assessment: A Short Test of English Proficiency

William K. Rice, Jr.,
Carole L. Perlman and
Donald J. Hill

Chicago Public Schools
Department of Research and Evaluation

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William K. Rice
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the annual meeting of
The American Educational Research Association
Boston, April 1980

TM800 218

The Functional Language Assessment: A Short Test of English Proficiency

William K. Rice, Jr.; Carole L. Perlman; and Donald J. Hill

Following the United States Supreme Court decision in Lau vs. Nichols, an increasing number of state legislatures have passed laws requiring that local educational agencies provide the limited-English-speaking-ability (LESA) student with equal educational opportunity through various bilingual educational programs. This combined with current world conditions which have increased the number of non-English-speaking people entering the United States has resulted in considerable expansion of bilingual programs in American schools. These programs entail a number of administrative decisions not the least of which is determining which students should be enrolled in bilingual programs. On the one hand, government regulations require that adequate educational programs be provided for students whose native language is not English. On the other hand, a school district's financial resources are limited and special programs for LESA students may be twice as expensive per child as the regular educational program. The most effective allocation of those resources may need be accomplished by selecting for enrollment in supplementary bilingual programs only those students who show definite need for such programs. Hence it is necessary to develop some objective means of determining the student's level of English proficiency. A number of tests that measure English proficiency have been written, but reliability and validity data concerning these tests often tends to be sketchy. Many of these tests require special equipment, take a long time to administer, or require that the person testing the student be fluent in the student's home language. Further, not all of the tests are appropriate for all age groups and some of the tests are intended only for Spanish-speaking students.

Following a review of the available English proficiency tests it was determined that there was a need for a valid, reliable screening instrument that could be quickly, easily and inexpensively administered by monolingual English teachers across the full age range of students from elementary to high school. Thus, the instrument had to be able to discriminate at the low end of English proficiency at the expense of discrimination above the level of moderate English proficiency. Three major componenets of the instrument were established. Students should be able to demonstrate their ability to: 1) comprehend English independent of their ability to speak English; 2) Produce spoken English by correctly repeating sentences spoked in English; 3) comprehend and form meaningful responses to open-ended questions.

Instrument development

Test items for each of the three areas, some of which were adapted from the Functional Language Survey, (Chicago Public Schools, 1977), were constructed and reviewed by experts in linguistics and test construction The best items were selected for use in a pilot study. Scoring criteria were established and a stratified random sample of 339 Chicago public school students from non-English-speaking backgrounds were tested. The stratification was on student age and English language proficiency. Based on the results

of the pilot test and the comments of the testing staff, items which provided the best estimates of the student's English proficiency and caused the least distruption were selected. For example, comprehension items such as "Touch your toes," caused some classroom behavior and control problems and were not included in the final instrument.

The final instrument, the Functional Language Assessment(FLA), contains 15 items and is divided into three parts: comprehension, production/repetition and comprehension/production. Separate objective scoring criteria are given for each part. The comprehension section consists of three commands that elicit no verbal responses, e.g., "Please put your hands on the table." These items are intended to tap a student's ability to understand English,independent of his ability to speak it. Ratings for these items are based on how quickly and correctly the child responds and whether the command must be repeated. The next five items comprise the production/repetition section. In this part of the test, a sentence is read to the child and he or she must repeat it verbatim. This section was included because it has been shown that the degree to which a student can correctly repeat a sentence is an indicator of his or her linguistic proficiency. Responses to these items are rated on the meaningfulness and completeness of the response and in some instances, on whether the tester had to read the item a second time. The third section of the test contains seven production/comprehension items, e.g., "Tell me how to play one of your favorite games," in which free speech is elicited from the student. Responses to these items are rated on the basis of comprehension, sentence structure and elaboration.

The scoring criteria were revised from the FLS scoring criteria using the information from the pilot test with each item rated on a scale from 0 to 5. These criteria were reviewed by linguistic experts for consistency and clarity. Using the FLA and the scoring criteria, students from several language backgrounds and English proficiency levels were tested and videotaped. The student responses were scored using the scoring criteria. Sample student responses for each item and the reasons for scoring were combined to produce an inservice videotape which was shown to all personnel who were to administer the FLA. The student's responses and the reasons for scoring were also incorporated in the scoring manual. The FLA and the scoring manual are located in the Appendix.

The Functional Language Assessment is administered individually in approximately 5 to 10 minutes. Younger students or those of severely limited English proficiency require the most time. The inservice training can be completed in about an hour and is necessary to acquaint the testers with the items and the scoring criteria. The inservice videotapes increase the inservice time by forty-five minutes. The testers do not need to be able to converse in the student's home language, since the directions and test items are all administered only in English.

Norming

The norming of English proficiency tests frequently presents problems concerning the choice of an appropriate normative group. In conjunction with the Office for Civil Rights, it was decided to use students who came from homes where English was the only language spoken. Separate FLA percentile ranks were established for pupils in each age group five to thirteen.

This is particularly important when no bilingual personnel are available or if the student speaks a language which is rarely encountered in the school system.

Chicago public schools with mean student reading scores near the national average were identified and nine of these schools were selected for the norming of the FLA. Students were stratified by age and random samples of approximately 110 students at each of ages 5,6,7,8,9,11 and 13 and approximately 60 students each at ages 10 and 12 were drawn from the nine schools. All students were monolingual English. The FLA was administered to these 900 students by research staff who had received the inservice training described above. Norms were established for each age. The means presented in Table 1 indicated that the FLA measures developmental aspects of English proficiency for monolingual English students from age 5 to age 8, but that the scores for the average monolingual English student age 9 and above will be restricted by the ceiling of the test.

Norms for each age were established and the FLA score which corresponds to the twenty-fifth percentile at each age level for monolingual English speaking students was selected as the minimum acceptable level of English proficiency. Students who scored at or able the twenty fifth percentile were considered as having adequate English language skills for participation in classes where the instruction is conducted exculsively in English. Students below the twenty-fifth percentile were recommended for placement in bilingual programs. The use of the twenty-fifth percentile criterion results in more students being identified for placement in bilingual programs than really need the program. This over-identification helps to prevent screening out of the bilingual program students that really need the bilingual program.

The use of the teacher's rating of English language proficiency, the teacher's suggestion on the need for home langauge instruction, and English reading achievement scores can be used to further screen students. For example, students scoring above the twenty-fifth percentile on an achievement test of English reading might be placed in a class where only English is used, even if their FLA scores are relatively low. In some instances, a low FLA score may represent shyness or uncooperativeness, rather than lack of English proficiency.

A set of decision rules was developed using all of the data available on a student. The decision rules used the student's responses to the FLA, the teacher's ratings of the student's English proficiency and English reading level, achievement and competency test scores to place a pupil into an appropriate instructional category. The four instructional categories were:

1. 70% home language and 30% English language instruction.
2. 50% home language and 50% English language instruction.
3. 30% home language and 70% English language instruction.
4. All English language instruction.

More than 80,000 students from homes where a language other than English is normally spoken were tested in May 1978 with the Functional Language Assessment and teacher ratings and achievement data were collected. The decision rules wer then used to place students into the appropriate instructional category. More than 20,000 students were recommended for an instructional category that included instruction in the student's home language.

Validity studies

In September 1978 teachers were asked to identify any students they thought had been placed in an inappropriate instructional category and indicate the appropriate instructional category. The teachers identified less than 2 percent of the placements as inappropriate. Most of the adjustments were to place students in an instructional program with more English. Less than one-half of one percent of the students were identified as not being in a bilingual program when in fact they did need instruction in their home language.

A second study of the validity of instructional placement was conducted in October 1978. Research staff randomly sampled a small number of students to be reevaluaged independently of FLA. Of the 97 students reevaluated, 45 percent were classified indentically with the FLA, 46 percent were higher in English proficiency and 8 percent were lower. Only 5 percent of the students classified to all-English programs were reclassified as needing a bilingual program.

Reliability studies

Three reliability studies were conducted using the FLA. The first study retested approximately one third of monolingual English students age 8 and 11 who participated in the norming study. The students were selected randomly and retested two to three weeks after the initial test. The mean score on the retest was 3.2 points higher for eight-year-old students and 1.4 points higher for the 11 year olds. Because of the ceiling effects the correlation coefficients were attenuated and therefore were relatively low. However, 65 percent of the total test scores on the retest were within 2 points of the original score and 81 percent were within 4 points of the original score.

In the second study, students from homes where a langauge other than English is spoken were stratified on the teacher's rating of English proficiency and a random sample of students ages 8 and 11 was selected. For these students a new answer sheet was sent to the testing teacher with a request to retest the student. If more than 2 students were selected for a teacher only the first two students were retained in the sample. Three hundred students were selected and 227 completed test forms were returned. The retesting was conducted within a month of the initial testing.

For the eight-year-olds, test-retest correlations ranged from .71 to .81 and the total test retest reliability was .92. For the 11 year olds test-retest items correlations were from .71 to .86 except the first 3 items (comprehension), which had correlation coefficients of .68, .46 and .60. Again these primarily reflect ceiling effects on those items, rather than actual changes in test-retest ratings. The total test retest correlation was .96

The third study was an interrater reliability study. Six schools with bilingual programs were selected and the students were stratified by age. Approximately 50 students at ages 5,8, and 11 were randomly selected. Two raters simultaneously administered the Functional Language Assessment to one student: One rater read the instructions and the items and the reader and the observer rated the students response independently. The reader and observer alternated roles. The mean total scores for each rater were very similar across ages as presented in Table 2. The item to item correlations range from .81 to .96 with most correlations above .90. The total test scores for the two raters correlate at .97. Thus, testers were able to reliably rate the same student behavior in the same way.

Factor Analysis

A factor analysis of the FLA as presented in Table 3 reveals a primary factor that accounts for 66 percent of the variance and a second factor that accounts for 9 percent of the variance. The factor structure remains stable when run on those needing a bilingual program and those not in need of a bilingual program. The three comprehension items load on the second factor and the comprehension/production items load on the primary factor. The production/repetition items load on the primary factor but also have substantial loadings on the second factor.

Conclusions

The Functional Language Assessment was constructed to allow the quick, efficient screening of students from a non-English background on English proficiency by school staff that do not speak the student's home language. The three reliability studies all indicate that the same observed student behavior will receive similar ratings from testers, that students who are tested once will get similar scores on a retest. The factor analysis indicates two factors that are stable across different populations. The primary factor seems to be the ability to produce oral English while the second factor is related to understanding spoken English. This factor structure reflects the design of the FLA. Thus the FLA seems to be measuring English language proficiency accurately for students with limited English proficiency.

The FLA is quickly and easily administered screening instrument for the identification of students who could need an educational program conducted in their home language. It is inexpensive, needs no special equipment or specialized personnel and it is particularly useful because it can be administered to any child regardless of home language or age. The FLA is not intended to be used as the sole rating of a student's English proficiency, but can be a useful, economical rough screening device that can determine which children need more extensive testing. Used in combination with teacher ratings and English achievement test scores, the FLA provides a highly valid way of identifying students who should be enrolled in bilingual programs.

References

Chicago Public Schools, Guidelines and Procedures Survey of Pupils with Language Needs Due to Non-English Background (Functional Language Survey). May 2, 1977.

Table 1

Functional Language Assessment Raw Score
Means by Age for Monolingual English Students

AGE	MEAN	SD	N
5	56.2	11.1	109
6	62.3	8.5	115
7	66.0	6.4	111
8	68.0	7.3	107
9	71.8	3.5	117
10	71.3	3.8	58
11	72.8	3.5	109
12	71.8	4.2	66
13	72.5	2.9	90

Table 2

Functional Language Assessment Raw Score
Means by Age by Rater

	Rater A			Rater B		
Age	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
5	24.6	18.9	58	24.8	19.1	58
8	30.4	24.5	49	30.4	25.5	49
11	38.6	28.4	52	38.9	28.2	52

Table 3

Factor Analysis of Functional Language Assessment

	Item	Factor 1 Loadings	Factor 2 Loadings	Commun-ality	Item Mean	Standard Deviation
	1	.18	.83	.72	4.84	0.79
Comprehension	2	.23	.78	.66	4.75	0.88
	3	.50	.59	.61	4.57	1.15
	4	.62	.56	.70	4.47	1.16
Production/	5	.75	.43	.75	4.13	1.35
Repetition	6	.70	.47	.71	4.23	1.27
	7	.74	.38	.70	3.91	1.38
	8	.78	.21	.65	3.20	1.71
	9	.80	.32	.74	3.89	1.44
	10	.82	.31	.77	3.89	1.46
Comprehension/	11	.83	.25	.74	3.67	1.58
Production	12	.84	.25	.77	3.69	1.57
	13	.84	.22	.76	3.48	1.59
	14	.83	.32	.79	3.95	1.51
	15	.74	.31	.65	4.03	1.72
Eigenvalue		9.94	1.35			
Percent of total Variance accounted for		66.3	9.0			

APPENDIX

Functional Language Assessment

This test includes 15 items designed to assess the ability of the student to use the English language. The student is individually tested on each item.

The test uses instructions in English as one means of assessing the student's English language competence. If the rater is bilingual, the student's first language can only be used as a "warm-up" device prior to starting the test. Once the test starts, all instructions and items must be given exclusively in English. DO NOT TRANSLATE ANY PART OF THE TEST OR INSTRUCTIONS. USE ONLY ENGLISH DURING THE TEST.

If the test must be given in a classroom with other students present, the student being tested should have his/her back to the other students and the tester should speak in a low voice audible to the student being tested but not to the other students in the class. At no time should the rater cue the student through gestures or signs.

Fill in the circle on the answer sheet which corresponds to the student's score on each item.

If the student does not score higher than a 1 on the first 8 items, stop testing and fill in the zero circles for items 9 to 15. If a student is tested, circles must be filled in for all 15 items.

If the student is in a special education class and the nature of the handicap is such that it would prevent the student from taking the test, do not administer the FLA.

Be sure there is a pencil on top of a blank sheet of paper in front of the student before the test begins.

Guidelines for the administration of Items 1-15.

ITEMS 1-3: COMPREHENSION

Items 1-3 have been selected so that the student can demonstrate his/her ability to comprehend English independent of his/her ability to speak English. The rater asks the student to perform simple tasks and rates the student on the degree of performance demonstrated. Each instruction can be repeated once.

Scoring Criteria

Score 0 The student does not respond to any part of the item or the response is totally incorrect.

Score 1 The student gives a partially correct response only after repetition of the item.

Score 2 The student gives a partially correct response after hearing the item the first time.

Score 3 The student responds fully, but only after repetition of the item.

Score 4 The student hesitates before responding fully to the item after hearing it the first time.

Score 5 The student responds promptly and correctly to the item after hearing it the first time.

Instruction and Items

The rater says to the student: "PLEASE DO WHAT I TELL YOU TO DO."

Note: The items may be repeated once if necessary.

1. PLEASE TOUCH YOUR NOSE.

2. PLEASE PUT YOUR HANDS ON THE TABLE (DESK).
   (Use the word "desk" if desk is more appropriate than table.
   Do not look at the table or desk)

3. PICK UP THE PENCIL AND PUT IT UNDER THE PAPER.

ITEMS 4-8: PRODUCTION/REPETITION

It has been shown that the degree to which a student can correctly repeat a sentence is an indication of the student's linguistic proficiency.

Scoring Criteria

Score 0 The student gives no response or a response that is incomprehensible.

Score 1 Student responds with isolated words or phrases. He/she does not communicate the meaning of the sentence.

Score 2 The student substitutes or omits words that change the meaning of the sentence. The basic structure of the sentence (subject-verb) is retained, but prepositional phrases, articles, conjunctions or modifiers may be omitted.

Score 3 The student adds, substitutes or omits words which do not change the meaning of the sentence.

Score 4 The student repeats the sentence exactly as given but only after the rater has repeated the sentence.

Score 5 The student repeats the sentence exactly as given after hearing the sentence once.

Instruction and Items

Teacher: LISTEN CAREFULLY. I WANT YOU TO SAY WHAT I SAY. IT'S A NICE DAY (points to student). YOU SAY...

Student: It's a nice day.

If the student does not respond, the rater should give the example again using questions. Note that this set of instructions is the only place in Section R in which the use of gestures or signals is permissible. In no case should the rater use the student's home language.

The following sentences on the opposite page are to be said to the student at a normal conversational rate. The rather should say the entire sentence before asking the student to repeat it. Although you may use questions in the example, do not use gestures or coach the student during the actual administration of the items.

If the student does not score higher than 3 on the first try, the rather should repeat the item once.

ITEMS 4-8:

ITEMS TO BE TESTED	SAMPLE RESPONSES	SCORE
4. "I watch television with my family every night".	"I watch television with my father every night".	2
	"I watch television last night".	2
5. "I often play with my friends by the fence".	"I also play with my friends".	2
6. "My school is small, but the school yard is big".	"My school".	1
	"My school is big".	2
	"My school is little, but my yard is big".	3
7. "I asked him whether he could play volleyball".	"I asked him whether he could play."	2
	"I asked him whether if he could play volleyball."	3
8. "We were determined to arrive at school earlier than usual."	"We were denominate to arrive at school easier than usual."	2
	"We were determined to arrive at school earlier."	3

•Note: If the student has not scored higher than 1 on any of the first eight items of the test, do not administer Items 9-15. Instead, code in zeroes on the answer sheet for Items 9-15. Do not leave these items blank.

ITEMS 9-15: COMPREHENSION/PRODUCTION

The ability to form meaningful responses to open-ended questions is another indicator of student's linguistic competence. The next seven items are designed to assess student comprehension and elicit verbal responses.

General Guidelines

Items 9-15 require that the rater assign a score between zero and five for each item. Zero signifies "not at all" and five signifies "perfectly;" ratings from one through four indicate progressively better performance on a given item.

Use the following criteria in rating the student's responses:

Comprehension: The student's response indicates that he/she understood the item.

Sentences Structure: The word order corresponds to that of acceptable spoken English: subject-verb agreement in number and tense as well as appropriate use of plurals, verb endings, auxilaries (do, does, did, etc.), pronouns, prepositions and conjunctions.

Elaboration: The verbal output is sufficiently elaborate to convey meaning. In some cases, a student who is proficient in English might respond to an item with a single word or short phrase. In order to accurately assess the student's proficiency, it is necessary to elicit as much free speech as possible. When necessary, use up to three probes to do this. If a student initially responds with a single word or an isolated phrase and is able to further elaborate after probing, the rater should give that response an appropriate score from 3 to 5. Unclear or minimal responses should be accepted only if it is apparent that the student cannot give a fuller reply.

Scoring Criteria

Note: The presence of an accent which does not interfere with effective communication should not be considered in determining a student's score.

0 - The student does not respond or gives an incomprehensible response.

1 - The response, usually given in isolated words or phrases, is not meaningful or does not completely answer the question or direction.

2 - The student responds meaningfully, using isolated words, phrases or simple sentences. The response may be unclear or not easily understandable and is awkwardly stated. There may be numerous grammatical inaccuracies.

In some instances, a student may respond with a single word, e.g.,

Teacher: What would you do in case of a fire in your home?

Student: Run.

The response, although short, answers the question. Additional probes, such as "Tell me more," "What else?", should be used. If the student cannot produce more speech even after probing, the one-word response should receive a score of 2.

3 - The response is readily comprehensible but awkwardly stated. There may be many grammatical errors, including lack of subject-verb agreement, inappropriate use of pronouns, plurals, prepositions or substitution of the present tense when the past tense is appropriate.

4 - The response is meaningful and readily comprehensible to the rater; there is a single inaccuracy in grammatical usage. If the student uses the present tense when the future or conditional tense is appropriate, his/her response would receive a score of 4. The substitution of the present tense for a simple past tense is a more serious error and should receive a score of 3 (see above).

5 - The response is equivalent to one which would be elicited from native English-speaking children. The response is readily understandable, is structurally correct and contains sufficient elaboration.

Instruction and Items

Say to the student: NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS. LISTEN CAREFULLY AND THEN ANSWER ME.

9. WHAT WILL YOU DO AFTER SCHOOL TODAY?
10. WHAT WOULD YOU DO IN CASE OF A FIRE IN YOUR HOME?
11. HOW DID YOU GET TO SCHOOL THIS MORNING (AFTERNOON)?
12. TELL ME HOW TO PLAY ONE OF YOUR FAVORITE GAMES.
13. TELL ME HOW TO GET TO YOUR HOUSE FROM SCHOOL.
14. LOOK AROUND THE ROOM. NAME THREE THINGS AND TELL ME WHAT THEY'RE USED FOR.

(THE RATER NOW SAYS TO THE STUDENT, "NOW I WANT YOU TO ASK ME A QUESTION.")

15. ASK ME WHAT I DO AFTER WORK.

* Item 9 - What will you do after school today?

Note: If the student responds with a complete sentence, look for use of the future tense, e.g., I will, I am going to, etc.

Sample Responses	Score	Comments
Home	1	The single-word response does not tell the rater how well the student understood the question. By omiting reference to any action (play, go home, etc.) the response is not sufficient to earn a higher score.
After school play	2	The student omitted the subject pronoun, the corresponding tense (I'll or I will) and there was minimal elaboration.
Go home	3	Although the response is minimal, it is a reduced response similar to ones made by native English-speakers who do not always answer a question with a complete sentence. Further probes are required. If the student can provide more information after probing, the response should be given an appropriate score between 3 and 5.
I go home and watch T.V.	4	Although the response is easily understandable and criteria for basic sentence structure were met, it scored a 4 because the future tense (I'll or I will) was not used to respond to an item which calls for the future tense.
I'm going home and help my mother. I'll go home to help my mother.	5 5	These responses are perfectly acceptable and meet all of the scoring criteria for a 5.

Item 10 - What would you do in case of a fire in your home?

Sample Responses	Score	Comments
My home can get fire.	1	The response received a score of 1 because the student did not really answer the question. Repeat the question or use probes.
Fire.	1	The response does not indicate how much the student understood. Use probes or repeat the question.
Tell the fireman coming.	2	The response was not easily understandable because of an inaccuracy of "to come."
I call fireman and I go out.	3	The response is comprehensible and sufficiently elaborated. However, the student omitted a key grammatical point ("would" or "I'd") and the article "the" before "firemen."
I call fireman and put out fire.	3	Substitution of present tense for the future tense and omission of the article "the" are two inaccuracies.
I try to yell out and get help.	4	Appropriate response but the student did not use the conditional from, "I would" or "I'd."
I'd call the fire department.	5	These responses are structurally correct and are equivalent to those produced by native speakers of English.
I would wake up everyone and take my baby brother downstairs.	5	
Wake up everyone and take my baby brother downstairs.	5	This response, although not a complete sentence, is structurally correct and shows considerable elaboration. It is a response similar to ones produced by native English speakers who might delete the subject ("I") when it is implied.

Item 11 - How did you get to school this morning (afternoon)?
Note: Substitute "afternoon" for "morning" only if the student did not come to school in the morning.

Sample Responses	Score	Comments
Walked.	2	These responses are appropriate, but if the rater cannot elicit further production with probes, score 2.
My mother she take me.	3	Score 3 for awkward construction and use of the present tense instead of the past.
I take the bus.	3	The response receives a score of 3 because the present tense was used instead of the past tense. The rater should repeat the item to give the student a chance to produce a more acceptable answer.
My mother she took me.	4	There is one inaccuracy in usage: the redundant use of the pronoun "she." Although this type of construction is often produced by native speakers of English, it should receive a score of 4.
I took the bus.	5	

Item 12 - Tell me how to play one of your favorite games.

Sample Responses	Score	Comments
Baseball.	1	This response does not completely answer the question. Repeat the question or use probes to elicit more speech.
Hit ball. Run. Safe.	2	Probes should be used to obtain more elaboration.
Hide and seek, I hides something, then nobody see it and someone catch me.	3	Good elaboration, and fairly comprehensible, but the response is awkward and there are several grammatical errors.
We have people standing on glue and one person suppose tag another person and then you run back to glue and the other person is it.	4	Good elaboration and easily understandable. There is a slight inaccuracy in verb usage ("suppose," rather than "supposed to").
Volleyball. (Rater: How do you play volleyball?) Throw the volleyball over the net and hit it back.	5	Although "volleyball" scores a 1; the student was, after probing, able to produce a structurally correct response. The response need not be a complete sentence in order to receive a score of 5.

Item 13 - Tell me how to get to your house from school.

Note: This item is similar to item 11, but it may be more difficult for some students. Students, especially older ones, should be encouraged through probing to give specific directions.

Sample Responses	Score	Comments
Go home.	1	The response does not answer the question. Repeat the Item or use probes.
Walk.	2	Meaningful single-word response; use probes to elicit more production. If the student does not say anything else, score the response 2.
Boys playground at St. Therese Way. Go straight to 22nd St., walk right and and then you go to 64 and my house is there.	3	Comprehensible, but the structure is awkward and there are a number of grammatical errors.
Well you take Campbell and then you go to your left where is Leland and then you go and then you turn to your right where is Maplewood and then the first door.	4	Deduct one point for incorrect word order, "where is Leland (Maplewood)," rather than "where Leland (Maplewood) is.:
Well there's like a big field out north of our house and it goes right by my school. That's how I go home.	5	Instructions are clear, precise and structurally correct.

Item 14 - Look around the room. Name three things and tell me what they're used for.

Note: Unless the student lists three things and tells what they are used for, the response should not receive a score higher than 2. If the student discusses only one or two things in the room, repeat the question or use probes to elicit further production.

Sample Responses	Score	Comments
Pen, book pencil	1	Repeat the item or use probes.
Books to read	2	Use probes and/or repeat the item to elicit further production, since the student listed only one thing in the room.
The tape recorder records, the chair you sit, the bag you carries.	3	Readily comprehensible, but there are several inaccuracies in usage.
Tape recorder to record what I say; the light up there gives us light, use the desk for write on all that.	4	There is a single inaccuracy in grammatical usage, i.e., the use of "write", rather "writing."
Paper is used for writing, books are for reading and chairs for sitting. Paper to write on, books to read, chair to sit on.	5	These responses are structurally correct and are equivalent to those produced by native speakers of English. A response need not be a complete sentence in order to receive a score of 5.

The rater says to the student, "Now I want you to ask me a question."

Item 15 - Ask me what I do after school.

Note: The purpose of the item is to see if the student can ask a question using the auxiliary "do."

Sample Responses	Score	Comments
You work	1	It is questionable whether the student understood the task since there is no evidence of the "do" auxiliary nor use of question intonation pattern.
You work?	2	The intonation of the response indicated to the rater that the student did understand that he/she was supposed to ask a question. The response did not fulfill the instruction. The item should be repeated.
You go home after school?	4	These responses received a score of 4 because the "do" form was omitted.
What you do after work?	4	
What do you do after work?	5	All four responses would receive a score of 5 even though "What do you do?" does not contain the prepositional phrase "after school."
What do you do?	5	
Do you go home after work?	5	
After work, what do you do?	5	